

wrong-headed. They trample on the health and well-being of our people. The abortion issue is the source of most of the mischief—this bill limits women's right to reproductive freedom, denies biomedical researchers—and sufferers from certain diseases—the hope of finding new treatments or cures using fetal tissue acquired under tight controls, and limits the ability of accrediting bodies to set standards for medical training.

Then there's title VI, a whole new bill that limits political advocacy by Federal grantees. Who is better prepared than providers of health, social, educational, and other services, to advise policymakers on the needs of their clients and the efficacy of various programs they participate in? And how do we justify proposing to violate these groups' first amendment rights to freedom of expression with their own money? The clear purpose of title VI is to silence the advocates for the poor, the sick, the elderly, the green, and other people whose needs or whose views of Federal obligations and Federal programs do not have the authors' support.

On the whole, the title II and the related legislative provisions of this bill are part and parcel with the entire bill—cruel and disastrous. This bill is a mean-spirited joke on anyone who believes that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to protect and improve the health and well-being of our population and to make the investments in our people that help them to be self-sufficient and our economy to be competitive.

The problems with this title illustrate why the entire bill deserves swift defeat and a complete rewrite. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2127.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] that would strike the language in the bill that clarifies the congressional intent regarding the interpretation of the Hyde amendment.

This Member was one of the first Members of Congress to speak against the 1993 Clinton administration directive that required States to fund Medicaid abortions in cases of rape or incest. This directive is an unjustified and incorrect interpretation of the law and of congressional intent. It is certainly not the intent of Congress to mandate States to fund Medicaid abortions in the case of rape or incest, regardless of State law. The 1993 Hyde amendment

to public law was very clearly not a mandate, but an enlargement on the limitation on the use of Federal funds, allowing States to use Medicaid funds to finance abortions in the case of rape or incest and of course to save the life on an indigent mother. The language in the bill we are considering today, would this Member hope once and for all, restates and further clarifies the original congressional intent in statute.

Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to oppose the Kolbe amendment.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of Mr. GANSKE's amendment; and reaffirm the traditional policy of the Congress toward accreditation of medical schools and teaching hospitals. I believe that the medical profession, itself, should establish responsible standards for the recognition and approval of graduate medical education programs.

Further, I strongly oppose attempts by this Congress to interfere with the content of medical education and training standards of a private accrediting board. The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] requirement, as currently written, allows individual medical residents—as well as institutions with religious or moral objections—to opt out of abortion training, so government intervention to protect individual conscience is not needed.

To prevent abortion training altogether because of the religious convictions of some, is ridiculous. Surely, this Congress will not be allowed to stand in the way of medical science and return us to an era of superstition and of strict religious control.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education,

and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

I also want to thank Chairman PORTER for the cooperation and assistance he has given the Veterans' Affairs Committee on the portion of the bill for the Veterans' Employment and Training Service [VETS] at the Department of Labor.

Despite deep cuts in many other programs, VETS would be maintained very close to historic funding levels.

Mr. Chairman, I especially want to commend Chairman PORTER for being extremely receptive to concerns raised by the Veterans' Affairs Committee regarding funding for the National Veterans Training Institute in this bill.

The \$2.8 million in the bill for fiscal year 1996 will enable the institute to continue providing quality training to both veterans groups and Government employees who help veterans find meaningful employment and job training.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

A PROGRAM THAT WORKS

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, Richard W. Riley, Secretary of the Department of Education and former Governor of my State of South Carolina, recently addressed the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation [CSAVR] as part of their annual meeting here in Washington. CSAVR is a national organization composed of the chief administrative officers of the State vocational rehabilitation agencies with responsibility for the administration of the Rehabilitation Act in the States and territories. They provide eligible individuals with mental or physical disabilities with the services needed for them to be placed in jobs in the competitive labor market.

In light of the recent attempts by the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee to diminish the work of these dedicated men and women, I urge my colleagues to read Secretary Riley's remarks.

REMARKS OF RICHARD W. RILEY

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to meet with you today. I want to thank Joe Owens and Elmer Bartels. I would like to recognize Judy Heumann, my Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services who has worked so effectively on these issues and her Deputy, Howard Moses who is here today.

A PROGRAM THAT WORKS

All of you are to be commended for the work you are doing in your states to help make the Vocational Rehabilitation program one of the shining examples of what works in our nation—a truly successful working relationship between states and the federal government—a program that has helped more than nine million individuals with disabilities, from all walks of life, to secure gainful employment.

Each year more than 200,000 people enter or return to the competitive labor market or become self-employed—becoming fully contributing taxpaying members of our national

community. You are filling a need that needs to be filled. A poll taken last year revealed that 68 percent of people of working age with disabilities are not working and need services to help them get to the next level.

It is a unique program—and one which works.

As a former governor, I understand the concerns of some seeking to limit federal involvement in some areas of our lives. I certainly am all for lowering the federal bureaucracy when it can be accomplished without loss of important services. In fact, at the Department of Education, we have proposed the elimination of 59 education programs and the consolidation of 27 others.

But I also know the cutting for the sake of cutting is not necessarily a positive thing. And the elimination of a federal role when it is necessary and legitimate is bad public policy.

There are certain important responsibilities that we must uphold at the national level in order to ensure continued high quality programs like vocational rehabilitation that are, in effect, run by the states.

We certainly do not want to micro-manage your rehabilitation programs. But we can help to facilitate these important programs and provide the financial support that will keep your vocational rehabilitation programs running effectively.

I am so pleased that in my own home state of South Carolina, I was able to play a role in the development of a strong network of facilities that provide services to mentally and physically disabled people across the state. The program is still growing and helping people from all over the state become contributing members of the economy.

I am pleased to see Charles La Rosa, the South Carolina State Director here today. Charles has continued to provide the leadership that makes this program the success that it is. All across the state, new training centers—which, as you all know, are one of the essential pieces of successful vocational rehabilitation—have been opened, some even rising out of the vacant buildings left by closed car dealerships.

Today, this network—which now has 22 facilities—can boast that no one who wants to participate in the program will have to go farther than 50 miles to get to one of these centers.

And I know that South Carolina is not alone in this success. I can cite success stories of individuals across the nation who were completely dependent upon others for support and who are now, because they have gotten the proper vocational training, entering the world of independent work and living.

Fully three-fourths of the people who have received rehabilitation training throughout the nation as the result of this program, and who are now gainfully employed, report that their own earned income is their primary source of support. This is extraordinary and speaks volumes to those who might characterize this program as just another government handout.

As most people agree—and as we certainly are hearing in the current debate over welfare reform—people do not prefer to be supported by others, whether by government entitlement or family. Most people want, more than anything, to work and be contributing members of society. This program gives millions of individuals that chance.

COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO JOB TRAINING

Of course, as you all know, vocational rehabilitation is more than just a job referral or search program. It is more than simple employment training. And this is a crucial distinction.

Because, while many individuals need little more than job training and a helpful

boost into the job market . . . a large majority need more assistance, guidance, encouragement and specialized services before they can become independent.

At its core, the vocational rehabilitation program offers a consistent, supportive, individualized, comprehensive treatment that helps to create a productive relationship or partnership between specially trained counselors and teachers, and individuals with disabilities.

At its best, it offers “one-stop shopping”—a means for disabled individuals to get into, or return to, common activity and increased productivity.

75 YEARS OF SUCCESS

Happily, Congress has long understood the value and importance of vocational rehabilitation. Since its creation 75 years ago, this program has been continually reauthorized and expanded with bipartisan support. It has included special features that do not exist in regular job training programs. And it has created additional safeguards and encouragement to coordinate among different agencies so that individuals in need of services may be served efficiently and without delay.

As we all know, these are uncertain times which require stern budgetary measures. But these times also require thoughtfulness and consideration. This is not the time for arbitrary and shortsighted action.

Certainly, there are proposals floating around Capitol Hill these days which arouse my concern in this regard. I am worried that in the budget-cutting, big government-shrinking zeal of these times, some very valuable programs—including vocational rehabilitation—could be harmed.

While I strongly share the sentiments of some of these reformers to improve accountability and provide greater services for more people who need them. . . I do not, as I said earlier, believe in wholesale cutting or consolidating without careful thought and clear justification.

The inclusion of vocational rehabilitation in a broad-based consolidation of job-training programs could have a lasting negative impact on this program, and more importantly, could harm the very people it is intended to help.

The vocational rehabilitation program is the only job training program that includes an eligibility criterion of physical or mental disability. Adequately meeting the needs requires well-trained staff capable of offering a wide array of specialized services. Consolidation with other job training programs could well endanger this vital specialized capacity.

Moreover, coordination between this program and other job training programs does not necessarily require a merging of these programs. States are already afforded great latitude and flexibility in a number of areas. Members of my staff have recently met with some of you who have developed statewide “one-stop shopping” programs that encourage coordination between employment training and vocational rehabilitation programs.

So I hope you understand that our commitment to this program remains as strong as ever. We will, of course, continue our work to improve the program, and continue to help states in their efforts to educate employers about disabilities.

Now I may be preaching to the choir today. But I cannot say how strongly I feel about helping those who can become independent, contributing members of our society to do so. And, if we can break down a few barriers and overcome some prejudices at the same time—so much the better.

When I was Governor of South Carolina, it was one of my greatest pleasures to work, along with my wife Tunky (who was also very active in this area) to expand opportunities in employment and rehabilitation.

I was so pleased recently to learn that in South Carolina, even with a relatively high unemployment rate, individuals who have been trained in the State vocational rehabilitation centers are among the most desired employees. They understand the value of work and supervision, know how to work with their peers and colleagues, and know the value of production.

And ultimately, we can't ask for anything more.

Anthropologist Margaret Meade, wrote, “If we are to achieve a richer culture. . . we must weave one in which each diverse human gift will find a fitting place.” I believe that working together, we can achieve the rich diverse culture that is the ultimate goal of the American experience.

This is the promise of America, the promise of education, and the promise of rehabilitation.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, with this legislation before us today we have been asked to make difficult choices. We have been asked to choose between funding for medical research and education, cancer research, and the right to choose. The committee has included regressive legislative language on choice, freedom of speech, and labor law, while decimating preschool, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education. And that is what is wrong with the 1996 Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill.

I applaud and support efforts by the committee to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] by 6 percent. It is no secret that I have long advocated such funding levels, particularly in light of the fact that a majority of this same Congress voted to cut NIH in the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution which I opposed.

Biomedical research is an important, cost-effective investment in our Nation's health. Less funding for NIH would have dramatic effects on all Americans, including threatening the health of our citizens, reducing thousands of research projects, reducing potential cost savings from future treatments, and jeopardizing U.S. competitiveness in the biomedical industry.

Over 80 percent of NIH's budget goes to universities, institutes, and medical schools, and to their researchers who are on the verge of significant breakthroughs in treating diseases such as cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's, and AIDS. These funds will continue research which could save millions of lives. I am proud to say that I have fought all efforts to cut NIH, including the levels contained in